

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 330 709

TM 016 277

AUTHOR Davidoff, Stephen H.; Pierson, Ellery M.
TITLE A Continued Look at the Promise of Schoolwide Projects.
INSTITUTION Philadelphia School District, PA. Office of Assessment.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Average Daily Attendance; Cohort Analysis; *Compensatory Education; Educational Trends; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Students; Grades (Scholastic); Longitudinal Studies; *Mathematics Achievement; Middle Schools; *Program Evaluation; *Reading Achievement; Remedial Mathematics; Remedial Reading; *School Districts; School Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; *Philadelphia School District PA

ABSTRACT

The continued implementation of Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects (SWPs) within the Philadelphia (Pennsylvania) School District during the 1989-90 school year is evaluated. A 5-year achievement summary is also presented. Data on attendance, report card grades, and normal curve equivalent (NCE) gains for 37 schools from the first SWP cohort are reviewed; and an initial examination is made of the 24 second cohort schools, which began implementation in the 1989-90 school year. Mathematics and reading achievement were the focus of the evaluation. Specifically, students' progress was monitored using multiple indicators: state-required measures of desired outcomes, participation in Chapter 1 Program Improvement, project level NCE change scores and percent of success, report card marks, 5-year achievement summary, and average daily attendance (ADA). Results indicate that: (1) SWP sites continue to outperform non-SWP Chapter 1 sites; (2) SWP students showed improvement in report card grades across the major curriculum areas as well as improvement in students' ADA; and (3) the Other School Comparison technique, developed by A. Davis and M. R. Quilling (1990), should be considered when analyzing data required to document continuation under the accountability requirements for SWPs, particularly with reference to mathematics. Twelve tables present study data, showing SWP reading and mathematics attainment for participating schools. (TJH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED330709



The School District of Philadelphia

A Continued Look at the Promise
of Schoolwide Projects

by

Stephen H. Davidoff

and

Ellery M. Pierson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

STEPHEN H. DAVIDOFF

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Office of Accountability and Assessment

TM016277

A Continued Look at the Promise
of Schoolwide Projects

by

Stephen H. Davidoff

and

Ellery M. Pierson

The School District of Philadelphia

Office of Assessment

Educational Programs Evaluation Unit

Testing Services Unit

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Unit

April 6, 1991

Chicago, IL

A Continued Look At the Promise of Schoolwide Projects

Introduction

Congress, in reauthorizing ESEA Chapter 1 in 1983, inserted a provision for Schoolwide Projects (SWP) which permitted districts to ignore student eligibility requirements in those schools where 75% or more of the students were from low income families. While this provided the opportunity of overcoming achievement deficits without becoming entangled in the supplement not supplant constraint, few districts took advantage of this provision because they were required to pay a matching share for all students in SWP who were not eligible for Chapter 1 services. The most recent reauthorization in July 1988 removed this matching requirement. This change enabled districts to use Chapter 1 funds and staff in SWP sites with complete flexibility. Today, there are more than 600 SWP located in over 35 states (Technical Assistance Center Conference, Regions B / D, Cleveland, OH, Dec. 1990).

A previous paper reported the planning and implementation for Schoolwide Projects in the School District of Philadelphia from 1985-1989 (Lytle, Davidoff, Pierson, Kemp and Herron, 1990). Over this period the number of SWP sites had gone from none to 11, then 37 to 91 sites in the 1990-1991 school year. Performance data available for year to year comparisons for the past three years showed NCE gains in reading and mathematics of Chapter 1 eligible students in the 37 Cohort 1 SWP sites. From Spring 1988 to Spring 1989 gains in reading averaged 4.97 NCEs; gains in mathematics averaged 9.66 NCEs. Schoolwide Projects appeared to be providing the greatest benefit to the neediest students in each of these sites.

Background

In 1983-84, the School District launched a school improvement program in targeted schools with help from a local foundation. With the advent of the Chapter 1 Technical Amendments, the District opted to designate eleven Chapter 1 school site as SWP during the 1986-87 and paid the matching share then required for non-eligible children receiving service. Therefore, when the Chapter 1 guidelines were changed in 1988, the District was prepared to expand the SWP program rapidly.

Several other events served to facilitate the rapid expansion and implementation of SWPs. The Superintendent had formed a Regulatory Task Force in the mid-1980's to determine how resources from various categorical programs could be used to support the basic instructional program. In addition, the Superintendent and Executive Director for Categorical Programs lobbied state and federal governments for greater flexibility (Lytle, et. al. 1990). Furthermore, a Chapter 1 Task force was established in 1987 and was charged with developing a program that would substantially improve the basic skills of Philadelphia's

students. The March 1988 Task Force Report proposed a two-year phase-in of a total restructured Chapter 1 program for students at risk, and the primary goal ... was to foster student success in the regular program. The underlying principles of the restructuring were: a) prevention rather than remediation (Task Force Report, 1988), b) monitoring indicators of progress (Davidoff, Pierson and Fishman, 1989) and, c) providing additional subdistrict-based school supportive staff to enhance the school-based planning process initially established in 1984. Finally, a combination of the way the District calculated school eligibility, i.e., unduplicated count of AFDC and Free/Reduced Lunches (Lytle, 1988), a broadened needs assessment section in the annual application (Davidoff, 1988), and the cooperation of the Pennsylvania Department of Education were crucial. Therefore, the infrastructure for SWP projects was well in place when Congress provided the Chapter 1 authorization in 1988.

Purpose of the Current Study

This paper provides a continued look at trends in attendance, report card marks, and NCE gains for the 37 Cohort 1 SWP sites, as well as an initial look at the 24 Cohort 2 SWP sites which began implementation in the 1989-90 school year.

Data Sources, Definitions and Findings

Monitoring pupil progress using multiple indicators has been one of the major principles of schoolwide project implementation from the beginning of the project (Davidoff, et. al., 1989). This emphasis has facilitated a prevention-centered focus rather than being oriented toward remediation (Chapter 1 Task Force Report, 1988). Listed below are several indicators which are monitored routinely. Many are related to the statutory requirements of Chapter 1, i.e., desired outcomes. Particular attention is paid to students whose low achievement would qualify them for Chapter 1 service even if their school was not designated as a Schoolwide Project site.

1. State-required measures of Desired Outcomes

In Pennsylvania, all Chapter 1 Schools were expected to attain a positive NCE Change from pretest (1989) to posttest (1990). In addition, pursuant to the statutory goals of Chapter 1 which require substantial progress on desired outcomes, the Pennsylvania State Department of Education required the Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to develop objectives in three areas: (a) achievement of success in the regular program, (b) attainment of grade level proficiency, and, (c) achievement in basic and more advanced skills. These objectives were defined as follows:

(a) Success in the Regular Program

Success in the regular program in Reading was defined as having 80 percent of the pupils receive a grade of A, B or C in Reading and Social Studies over a five-year period. This was measured by sub-

tracting the 1989 base line percent of pupils receiving A's, B's and C's in Reading and Social Studies from 80% and dividing the difference by five ($80\% - 60\% / 5 = 4.0\%$ per year). For Mathematics the goal was 80% of the pupils receiving A's, B's and C's in Mathematics and Science over five years, measured the same as Reading.

(b) Grade Level Proficiency

Grade Level Proficiency was measured essentially the same as success in the regular program. In Reading, 80 percent of the pupils should be reading on grade level at the end of five years ($1/5$ the difference expected to be attained each year). In Mathematics the goal was 80% of the pupils receiving A's, B's and C's in Mathematics over five years; measured the same as Reading.

(c) Achievement in Basic and Advanced Skills (Citywide Tests)

Citywide Tests to assess achievement under 3 different conditions:

- (1) Schools which demonstrated a negative Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) change during the prior year (1988-89) required an NCE change greater than 0.
- (2) Schools which had positive NCE gains in the prior year (1988-89), but less than the State requirement, were to attain rates of growth as follows over two years.

	State Standards	
	Reading	Mathematics
Elementary Schools	3.0 NCE	4.5 NCE
Middle Schools	2.0 NCE	3.0 NCE

- (3) Schools which gain during the prior year (1988-89) equalled or exceeded the State criterion were required to maintain an NCE growth greater than 0.

Appendices A-1, A-2, and A-3 contain the school by school results for Cohort 1, Cohort 2 and all other Chapter 1 Non-Schoolwide project schools respectively. School organizations with grade levels above grade 8 were excluded from this analysis because there are no SWP with grade organizations above grade 8. Tables 1 and 2 below summarize and display the number and percentage of sites which successfully attained each of the requirements. For both reading and mathematics the preponderance of evidence favored the SWP sites over other Chapter 1 schools. In reading achievement a higher percentage of SWP sites (Cohort 1 and 2 combined) had positive NCEs, positive Basic/Advanced Skills outcomes, success in the regular program and attainment of grade level proficiency than the Non-SWP sites. Similar finding were attained for mathematics except for grade level proficiency which slightly favored the Non-SWP sites.

Table 1 : Attainment of Desired Outcomes for Reading In Schoolwide Project Schools and Non-Schoolwide Project Schools for the Statutory Goals of Chapter 1 during the 1989-90 school year for Chapter 1 Participants

Desired Outcome Statutory Goals	Cohort1 (N=37)	Cohort2 (N=25)	Schoolwides (N=62)	Non-Schoolwides (N=66)
ANNUAL REQUIREMENT				
Positive NCE	27	21	48 (77.0%)	40 (63.5%)
Basic/Advance Skill	24	16	40 (64.5%)	37 (59.7%)
5 YR REQUIREMENT				
Success Reg Program	13	10	23 (37.1%)	17 (25.6%)
Gr Level Proficiency	5	2	7 (11.3%)	4 (6.1%)

Note: Percentages have been adjusted to compensate for a few missing cases on the NCE and the Basic/Advance Skills indicators.

Table 2 : Attainment of Desired Outcomes for Mathematics in Schoolwide Project Schools and Non-Schoolwide Project Schools for the Statutory Goals of Chapter 1 during the 1989-90 school year for Chapter 1 Participants

Desired Outcome Statutory Goals	Cohort1 (N=37)	Cohort2 (N=25)	Schoolwides (N=62)	Non-Schoolwides (N=66)
ANNUAL REQUIREMENT				
Positive NCE	31	21	52 (83.9%)	46 (74.2%)
Basic/Advance Skill	29	19	48 (80.0%)	44 (70.9%)
5 YR REQUIREMENT				
Success Reg Program	9	5	14 (22.6%)	15 (23.1%)
Gr Level Proficiency	17	6	23 (37.1%)	17 (26.1%)

Note: Percentages have been adjusted to compensate for a few missing cases on the NCE and the Basic/Advance Skills indicators.

2. Participation in Chapter 1 Program Improvement

To avoid Program Improvement status, schools were required to demonstrate a positive NCE change during 1989-90 AND attain at least one of the three Chapter 1 statutory goals. Appendix A-1 through A-3

displays each Chapter 1 school's performance with respect to NCE change scores and attainment in each of the statutory requirements cited above. On the basis of their performance, fifteen Cohort 1 SWP, ten Cohort 2 SWP and 36 Non-Schoolwide Project sites were required to participate in Chapter 1 Program Improvement activities. A lower percentage of SWP sites (40.3%) than Non-SWP sites (54.5%) were required to participate in mandated Program Improvement. These data are summarized in Table 3 located in Appendix A-4.

3. Project level NCE Change Scores and Percent of Success

The evidence of a Chapter 1 effect above and beyond the effect of the regular program has historically been defined as a pretest to posttest improvement in the NCEs. This could be described in two ways: 1) The improvement of the NCE associated with the mean score of the group served (classic model A), and 2) the percentage of students who improved their NCEs from pretest to posttest. While either approach will permit normed referenced comparisons, the former (classic model A) focuses exclusively on the national sample used to norm the achievement test while the latter (Percent of Success) examines norm reference impact grade by grade for each project in relation to the local school district's Chapter 1 group as a whole (Davidoff et. al., 1989). In reading, the spring 1990 test results revealed that in six (6) of eight grades (1-8) the percent of pupils with higher posttest scores favored SWP in comparison to the mean for all Chapter 1 reading services. Also, the NCE change scores in five (5) of eight (8) grades (1-8) also favored SWP. Results in mathematics were similar to reading favoring SWP in thirteen (13) of the sixteen (16) possible comparisons. Tables 4a and 4b located in Appendix A-5 contain these comparisons.

4. Report Card Marks

Comparisons of June 1988 and June 1990 report card marks of ALL students for the four basic subjects showed improvement in the majority of the Cohort 1 sites in each major curriculum area. The percentage of students attaining A, B, or C increased in 23 sites in Reading (62%), 28 sites in both Mathematics and in Science (76%), and 26 sites in Social Studies (70%). These data are summarized in Table 5 located in Appendix A-6.

5. Five Year Achievement Summary

Appendices A-7 and A-8 display reading and mathematics achievement results for each of the Cohort 1 SWP sites in three preprogram years 1985-1988 and two program years 1988-1990. From the Spring 1989 to Spring 1990, gains in reading averaged 2.25 NCEs; in mathematics the average NCE gain was 3.60. During the fifth year (second project year), 13 Cohort 1 SWP sites exceeded the 3 year preprogram average in reading and 6 Cohort 1 SWP sites exceeded the 3 year preprogram average in mathematics. In reading, the "two year" aggregated achievement gains of educationally deprived students in grades 2-8 in 21 SWP sites exceeded the average gain of Chapter 1 children in the school during the three years prior to becoming a SWP; for mathematics, 9 sites demonstrated this type of achievement. The data suggest that those sites selecting the Same School Accountability Comparison at the end of the 1990-91 school year may encounter problems in attaining the

required success for continuing as a schoolwide project due to large NCE gains in mathematics which both the Schoolwides and the District achieved during 1986-1988. A project summary of Cohort 1 participants in grades 2 through 8 is provided in Table 6 below.

Table 6 : Comparison of Preprogram Years and Program Years NCE Achievement in Reading and Mathematics for Cohort 1 Schoolwide Projects (N=37) from September 1985 to June 1990

	Preprogram Years			Program Years		
	1985-86	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90	1990-91
READING ACHIEVEMENT						
Students (N)	2473	6479	6243	6080	6725	Pending
Average Pretest NCE	39.67	27.66	28.15	28.37	33.02	Pending
Average Posttest NCE	30.31	33.22	34.03	33.34	35.27	Pending
Average NCE Change	-9.36	5.75	5.90	4.97	2.25	Pending
Aggregated Gain			3.24		3.54	Pending
MATH ACHIEVEMENT						
Students (N)	2021	4404	4264	4153	4468	Pending
Average Pretest NCE	38.72	25.55	27.64	29.21	37.97	Pending
Average Posttest NCE	34.03	38.06	39.50	38.37	41.57	Pending
Average NCE Change	-4.68	12.51	11.86	9.66	3.60	Pending
Aggregated Gain			8.86		6.51	Pending

6. Average Daily Attendance (ADA)

The data indicate that 28 of the 37 schools (76%) have improved attendance since becoming SWPs. This is slightly more positive than the findings reported by Lytle et al., i.e. 70% (1990). Twenty-five of the sites (68%) improved their attendance from spring 1989 to spring 1990. These data are summarized in Table 7 located in Appendix A-9.

Summary of Results

Evidence from a variety of indicators continues to favor Schoolwide Project sites over other Chapter 1 Non-SWP sites/services. A higher percentage of SWP site made substantial progress on desired outcomes in the three statutory goals of Chapter 1 than the Non-SWP sites. Furthermore, a lower percentage of SWP sites than Non-SWP sites were required to participate in mandated Chapter 1 Program Improvement. When compared with the average of the Chapter 1 reading and mathematics services within grades 1 - 8, Schoolwide Projects achieved more consistently positive results, i.e., NCE gain or percentage of students with higher posttest scores, than other

Chapter 1 projects serving similar grade ranges. For ALL pupils within SWP sites, the data suggest improvement in report card marks across the major curriculum areas and in the pupils' Average Daily Attendance. Although the NCE gains made during the fifth year (i.e., 3 year preprogram and 2 year program) in both reading and mathematics were largely positive, the data suggests that the Other School Comparison technique (Davis and Quilling, 1990) should also be considered when analyzing the data required to document continuation under the accountability requirements for SWP --particularly in mathematics.

Given the basic philosophy of Schoolwide Projects to upgrade the entire educational program in a school that has at least 75 percent of its children from low income families, one may question if the continuation decision should be based solely upon the performance of Chapter 1 eligible pupils. What SWP has allowed schools to do is to provide a "whole school" approach which supports student success in the daily program. Thus, by recognizing the importance of the regular classroom the key instructional strategy that emerges is one of prevention rather than remediation. The latter strategy does not bring resources to bear until the a student has already experienced failure! While we believe that the performance of the Chapter 1 population should be always be of primary concern, it might be more appropriate and philosophically consistent to evaluate performance for the whole school.

Future Research Agenda

There are several features of Schoolwide Projects which are under investigation. Most pressing at this time are questions of the relative advantages and disadvantages of the Same School and Other School Comparison Models required to determine the continuation of SWP sites. Of continuing interest are trend analyses among Cohorts. Here we envision blocking on Cohort while using school characteristics (e.g., attendance, grade organization, eligibility levels, models) and student characteristics (e.g., pretest level, report marks, stability vs. mobility) as covariates. In addition, we are conducting a study designed to examine the relationships of changes in resources to changes in a variety of student outcomes. Here we anticipate using multiple regression to assess the importance of the resources on the outcomes.

A P P E N D I X A

APPENDIX A - 1

Summary of Chapter 1 School Attainment for the 1989 - 1990 School Year Schoolwide Project Sites, Cohort 1

PSD	STATE SCHOOL NAME	READING IMPROVEMENT				MATHEMATICS IMPROVEMENT				IN PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT					
		REG	PRG	ON	LEV	NCE	GAIN	REG	PRG	ON	LEV	NCE	GAIN	READING	MATHEMATICS
130	6528	Harrington	NO	NO	YES	2.60	YES	YES	YES	3.36					
136	3611	McMichael	NO	NO	NO	-1.13	NO	NO	YES	4.82	IN				
143	3775	Wilson	YES	NO	YES	5.70	YES	YES	YES	5.98					
220	3617	Alcorn	NO	NO	YES	1.20	NO	NO	YES	4.90					
242	3632	Reynolds	NO	YES	NO	0.02	NO	NO	YES	0.89					
243	3813	Palumbo	NO	NO	YES	1.99	NO	NO	YES	10.47					
249	7225	Waring	YES	YES	YES	1.54	YES	YES	YES	4.35					
254	7228	Key	NO	NO	NO	-0.04	NO	YES	NO	-4.04	IN				IN
259	3650	Nebinger	NO	NO	NO	1.92	NO	NO	YES	8.03	IN				
273	3659	George Washington	YES	YES	YES	3.20	NO	YES	YES	6.34					
427	3786	Dick	YES	NO	YES	4.24	YES	YES	YES	7.20					
430	5187	Heston	NO	NO	YES	2.08	NO	NO	YES	4.41					
431	3795	Kenderton	NO	NO	YES	4.73	NO	YES	YES	4.18					
433	3671	Leidy	NO	NO	NO	-1.60	NO	NO	YES	6.43	IN				
440	6541	M.H. Stanton	YES	NO	YES	7.38	NO	NO	YES	9.68					
442	3680	Walton	NO	NO	NO	-2.47	NO	NO	YES	4.97	IN				
443	3681	Whittier	NO	YES	NO	-0.10	NO	NO	YES	2.78	IN				
444	5292	E.D. Allen	YES	YES	YES	1.45	NO	YES	NO	2.41					
446	5040	Duckrey	NO	NO	NO	-0.59	NO	NO	YES	2.07	IN				
451	3624	F.Douglass	NO	NO	YES	0.38	NO	YES	YES	2.22					
453	3625	Gideon	NO	NO	NO	-0.83	NO	NO	YES	2.35	IN				
457	3630	Meade	NO	NO	NO	1.14	NO	NO	NO	-2.63	IN				IN
526	3688	Elkin	NO	NO	NO	-0.48	NO	NO	YES	3.58	IN				
530	5120	Hackett	YES	NO	YES	2.33	YES	YES	NO	-4.34					IN
531	3793	Harrison	NO	NO	YES	1.26	NO	NO	YES	3.74					
532	5125	Hartranft	NO	NO	YES	3.87	NO	NO	NO	-1.38					IN
534	3694	Ludlow	NO	NO	YES	3.23	NO	NO	NO	-2.38					IN
535	5293	McKinley	YES	NO	YES	4.58	NO	YES	YES**	5.45					
547	5123	Cramp	YES	NO	YES	4.16	NO	NO	YES	5.25					
548	3645	Kearny	NO	NO	YES	6.54	NO	YES	YES	10.35					
556	3655	Spring Garden	YES	NO	YES	7.93	YES	YES	YES	6.20					
632	3720	Mifflin	YES	NO	NO	-1.35	NO	YES	YES	0.19	IN				
643	3731	Wister	NO	NO	YES	4.91	NO	NO	YES	6.06					
644	3717	Lingelbach	YES	NO	YES	8.01	YES	YES	YES	10.61					
647	5294	J.B. Kelly	YES	NO	YES	3.23	YES	YES	YES	4.13					
738	6534	McClure	NO	NO	NO	-1.78	YES	YES	NO	-5.15	IN				IN
744	3755	Taylor	NO	NO	YES	0.95	NO	NO	YES	1.09					

DEFINITIONS:

"-0-" appears where 1990 NCE Gains were not available

REG PROG refers to success in the regular program (marks of A, b, or C in Reading and Social Studies or Math and Science).

ON LEV refers to the proportion of students functioning at or above grade level in reading or mathematics.

YES indicates that an objective was attained, NO, that it was not.

** indicates that the NCE "YES" or "NO" does not apply. Attainment of the Basic and Advanced Skills objective could not be determined because the 1988-89 NCE change was not available for computing the attainment criterion.

APPENDIX A - 2

Summary of Chapter 1 School Attainment for the 1989 - 1990 School Year Schoolwide Project Sites, Cohort 2

PSD	STATE SCHOOL NAME	READING IMPROVEMENT				MATHEMATICS IMPROVEMENT				IN PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT					
		REG	PRG	ON	LEV	NCE	GAIN	REG	PRG	ON	LEV	NCE	GAIN	READING	MATHEMATICS
120	3598 Barry	NO	NO	YES	1.42	NO	NO	YES	3.14						
121	3599 Belmont	YES	NO	YES	1.86	YES	YES	YES	1.39						
133	3807 Huey	YES	NO	YES	3.34	NO	NO	NO	0.59						IN
137	3798 Mitchell	NO	NO	NO	-0.72	NO	NO	NO	-1.34	IN					IN
147	4732 Locke	YES	NO	YES	5.95	YES	YES	YES	17.21						
237	3629 McDaniel	YES	NO	NO	1.36	YES	YES	YES	8.83						
239	4868 Morris	NO	NO	YES	3.30	NO	NO	YES	2.10						
245	3635 E.M. Stanton	NO	YES	NO	-0.68	NO	NO	NO	-2.65	IN					IN
438	3675 T.M. Peirce	NO	YES	NO	1.13	NO	NO	YES	5.98						
517	7175 Bilingual Magnet	NO	NO	NO **	-2.71	NO	NO	YES**	4.26	IN					
522	4733 George Clymer	NO	NO	YES	1.85	NO	NO	YES	2.12						
529	3690 Ferguson	NO	NO	NO	1.65	NO	NO	YES	3.74	IN					
533	3693 Hunter	NO	NO	YES	3.34	NO	NO	YES	5.44						
539	5121 Potter-Thomas	NO	NO	YES	3.36	NO	NO	YES	0.73						
541	3702 Sheppard	NO	NO	YES	0.06	NO	NO	NO	-1.07						IN
542	3703 Welsh	YES	NO	YES	2.75	NO	YES	YES	4.00						
553	3800 Sheridan	YES	NO	YES	1.89	YES	YES	NO **	-1.43						IN
622	3709 Emlen	YES	NO	YES	1.00	NO	NO	YES	2.11						
624	3791 Fulton	NO	NO	NO	1.20	NO	NO	YES	7.33	IN					
628	3715 Kinsey	YES	NO	NO	-2.73	NO	NO	YES	3.73	IN					
639	3727 Steel	NO	NO	NO	0.27	NO	NO	YES	4.35	IN					
721	3733 Birney	NO	NO	YES	2.70	NO	NO	YES	7.14						
729	4963 Stearne	YES	NO	YES	1.01	YES	YES	YES	4.63						
732	3743 Howe	NO	NO	YES	6.97	NO	NO	YES	7.04						
751	5183 Bethune	YES	NO	YES	0.87	NO	NO	YES	1.45						

DEFINITIONS:

"-0-" appears where 1990 NCE Gains were not available

REG PROG refers to success in the regular program (marks of A, b, or C in Reading and Social Studies or Math and Science).

ON LEV refers to the proportion of students functioning at or above grade level in reading or mathematics.

YES indicates that an objective was attained, NO, that it was not.

** indicates that the NCE "YES" or "NO" does not apply. Attainment of the Basic and Advanced Skills objective could not be determined because the 1988-89 NCE change was not available for computing the attainment criterion.

APPENDIX A - 3

Summary of Chapter 1 School Attainment for the 1989 - 1990 School Year - Non Schoolwide Project Sites

PSD	STATE SCHOOL NAME	READING IMPROVEMENT				MATHEMATICS IMPROVEMENT				IN PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT				
		REG	PRG	ON	LEV	NCE	GAIN	REG	PRG	ON	LEV	NCE	GAIN	READING
111	7246 Shaw Middle	NO	NO	NO	-2.14	NO	NO	YES	1.18	IN				
112	7249 Sulzberger Middle	NO	NO	NO	-1.15	NO	NO	NO	-0.40	IN			IN	
113	3832 Tilden Middle	NO	NO	NO	-0.48	NO	NO	YES	0.61	IN				
116	6521 Turner Middle	NO	NO	NO	-0.73	NO	NO	YES	5.24	IN				
123	3601 Bryant	NO	NO	YES	5.46	NO	NO	YES	6.60					
125	3602 Catharine	YES	NO	YES	1.73	NO	NO	YES	3.23					
126	3782 Comegys	YES	NO	NO	-1.14	NO	NO	NO	-0.59	IN			IN	
127	3604 Drew	NO	NO	YES	7.55	NO	NO	YES	7.15					
131	3608 Harriety	NO	NO	NO	-0.58	NO	NO	YES	0.53	IN				
134	6530 Lea	NO	NO	YES	2.44	NO	NO	YES	8.10					
135	6533 Longstreth	YES	NO	NO	-0.88	NO	NO	YES	6.62	IN				
138	6535 Morton	NO	NO	YES	3.17	NO	YES	YES	2.61					
141	3614 Rhoads	NO	NO	YES	0.31	NO	NO	YES	1.63					
142	3615 Martha Washington	NO	NO	NO	-1.12	NO	NO	NO	-0.32	IN			IN	
148	6763 Daroff	NO	NO	NO	-1.41	NO	NO	YES	1.98	IN				
149	3663 Blankenburg	NO	NO	YES	5.41	NO	NO	YES	9.80					
211	7237 Barratt Middle	NO	NO	YES	0.48	NO	NO	NO	-0.58				IN	
212	7251 Vare Middle	NO	NO	YES	1.47	NO	NO	NO	-0.62				IN	
213	7252 Vaux Middle	NO	NO	NO	-3.50	NO	NO	YES	1.13	IN				
221	3618 Bache	NO	NO	YES	1.25	NO	NO	YES	4.72					
224	3620 Bregy	NO	NO	YES	2.29	YES	YES	YES	11.47					
226	3622 Childs	NO	NO	YES	1.85	NO	NO	YES	9.50					
230	3789 Durham	NO	YES	YES	0.59	NO	NO	-0-**-0-						
238	3649 Meredith	NO	YES	-0-**-0-		NO	NO	-0-**-0-						
240	3799 Wm. S. Peirce	NO	NO	NO	0.54	NO	NO	YES	5.70	IN				
244	3634 Smith	YES	NO	YES	9.32	NO	NO	NO	-0.85				IN	
248	3805 Arthur	YES	NO	YES	3.52	YES	YES	NO	-0.36				IN	
251	3642 Jackson	NO	YES	YES	6.01	NO	NO	NO	-4.10				IN	
258	3647 Kirkbride	YES	NO	YES	2.08	YES	YES	YES	0.74					
264	3654 Southwark	NO	NO	YES	3.71	NO	NO	YES	5.22					
269	3657 Taggart	NO	NO	NO **	-0.44			-0-**-0-		IN				
272	3658 Vare	YES	NO	YES	4.45	YES	YES	YES	5.18					
411	7240 FitzSimons Middle	NO	NO	YES	1.60	NO	NO	YES	1.48					
412	7241 Gillespie Middle	NO	NO	NO	0.47	NO	NO	YES	6.07	IN				
413	7247 Shoemaker Middle	NO	NO	NO	-4.38	NO	YES	YES	3.08	IN				
415	6522 Rhodes Middle	NO	NO	NO	-1.95	NO	NO	YES	1.46	IN				
422	3662 Blaine	NO	NO	NO	-0.20	NO	YES	YES	2.10	IN				
424	3664 Cassidy	NO	NO	YES	2.35	NO	YES	YES	5.01					
426	3666 Cleveland	YES	NO	YES	1.98	YES	YES	YES	4.14					
429	3792 Hanna	NO	NO	NO	-3.47	NO	NO	YES	4.28	IN				
439	6540 Pratt	NO	NO	YES	4.40	YES	NO	YES	1.19					
445	3806 L.P. Hill	YES	NO	YES	4.80	YES	YES	YES	7.27					

DEFINITIONS:

"-0-" appears where 1990 NCE Gains were not available

REG PROG refers to success in the regular program (marks of A, b, or C in Reading and Social Studies or Math and Science).

ON LEV refers to the proportion of students functioning at or above grade level in reading or mathematics.

YES indicates that an objective was attained, NO, that it was not.

** indicates that the NCE "YES" or "NO" does not apply. Attainment of the Basic and Advanced Skills objective could not be determined because the 1988-89 NCE change was not available for computing the attainment criterion.

APPENDIX A - 3 Continued

Summary of Chapter 1 School Attainment for the 1989 - 1990 School Year - Non Schoolwide Project Sites

PSD	STATE SCHOOL NAME	READING IMPROVEMENT				MATHEMATICS IMPROVEMENT				IN PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT				
		REG	PRG	ON	LEV	NCE	GAIN	REG	PRG	ON	LEV	NCE	GAIN	READING
447	5188 Wright	YES	NO	NO	-1.14	NO	NO	YES	2.46	IN				
456	3626 Wm. Kelley	NO	NO	YES	1.34	NO	NO	YES	4.63					
510	7243 Jones Middle	NO	NO	NO	-2.20	NO	NO	YES	3.10	IN				
511	7244 Penn Treaty Middle	NO	NO	NO	-2.55	NO	YES	NO	1.03	IN				
512	7248 Stetson Middle	NO	NO	NO	-0.53	NO	NO	NO	0.46	IN				IN
513	7254 Wanamaker Middle	YES	YES	NO	-1.70	NO	NO	YES	2.02	IN				
514	7257 Stoddart-Fleishe	NO	NO	YES	0.98	NO	NO	NO	-3.66					IN
520	7526 Adaire	YES	NO	NO	-0.42	NO	NO	NO	-2.18	IN				IN
521	3684 H.A. Brown	NO	NO	YES	4.82	YES	NO	YES	2.99					
523	6525 Conwell Middle	NO	NO		-0-**-0-	NO	NO		-0-**-0-					
525	3687 Dunbar	NO	NO	NO	-2.07	YES	YES	NO	-3.48	IN				IN
528	5039 Fairhill	YES	NO	YES	1.43	YES	YES	YES	1.98					
537	3697 Moffet	NO	NO	YES	2.52	YES	YES	YES	6.50					
540	3701 Richmond	NO	NO	NO **	-2.66	NO	NO	NO	-6.10	IN				IN
544	6544 Willard	NO	NO	YES	3.65	YES	YES	NO	-0.29					IN
630	3718 Logan	YES	NO	YES	9.86	NO	NO	YES	6.17					
633	3721 Pastorius	NO	NO	YES	0.95	NO	NO	NO	-0.38					IN
634	3722 Pennell	NO	NO	YES	0.07	NO	NO	YES	0.80					
641	5122 Cook-Wissahickon	YES	NO	YES	4.49	YES	NO	YES	6.32					
645	3726 Dobson	YES	NO	NO	2.07	YES	YES	NO	-2.69					IN
727	3739 Finletter	NO	NO	YES	3.11	NO	NO	YES	2.67					
742	3752 Smedley	YES	NO	NO	-1.46	YES	YES	YES	5.25	IN				
753	3724 Rowen	NO	NO	YES	1.93	NO	NO	NO	-1.00					IN
773	6767 Clemente Middle	NO	NO	YES	2.47	NO	NO	YES	1.55					

DEFINITIONS:

"-0-" appears where 1990 NCE Gains were not available

REG PROG refers to success in the regular program (marks of A, b, or C in Reading and Social Studies or Math and Science).

ON LEV refers to the proportion of students functioning at or above grade level in reading or mathematics.

YES indicates that an objective was attained, NO, that it was not.

** indicates that the NCE "YES" or "NO" does not apply. Attainment of the Basic and Advanced Skills objective could not be determined because the 1988-89 NCE change was not available for computing the attainment criterion.

APPENDIX A-4

Table 3: Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement Based on 1989-90 Results
Schoolwide Projects Vs Non-Schoolwide Project Site With Grade levels K-8

Code	Name	SWP Cohort	Reading	Mathematics	Both
126	Comegys				IN
131	Harrity		IN		
133	Huey	2		IN	
135	Longstreth		IN		
136	McMichael	1	IN		
137	Mitchell	2			IN
142	Washington, M.				IN
148	Daroff		IN		
244	Smith			IN	
245	Stanton, E M	2			IN
248	Arthur			IN	
251	Jackson			IN	
254	Key	1			IN
259	Nebinger	1	IN		
269	Taggart		IN		
422	Blaine		IN		
429	Hanna		IN		
433	Leidy	1	IN		
442	Walton	1	IN		
443	Whittier	1	IN		
446	Duckrey	1	IN		
447	Wright		IN		
453	Gideon	1	IN		
457	Meade	1			IN
520	Adaire				IN
525	Dunbar				IN
526	Elkin	1	IN		
529	Ferguson	2	IN		
530	Hackett	1		IN	
532	Hartranft	1		IN	
534	Ludlow	1		IN	
540	Richmond				IN
541	Sheppard	2		IN	
544	Willard			IN	
553	Sheridan	2		IN	
624	Fulton	2	IN		
628	Kinsey	2	IN		
632	Mifflin	1	IN		
633	Pastorius			IN	
639	Steel	2	IN		
645	Dobson			IN	
738	McClure	1			IN
742	Smedley		IN		

APPENDIX A-4 Continued

Table 3: Chapter 1 Schools in Program Improvement Based on 1989-90 Results
Schoolwide Projects Vs Non-Schoolwide Project Site With Grade levels K-8

Code	Name	SWP Cohort	Reading	Mathematics	Both
753	Rowen			IN	
111	Shaw MS		IN		
112	Sulzberger				IN
113	Tilden MS		IN		
116	Turner MS		IN		
211	Barratt MS			IN	
212	Vare MS			IN	
213	Vaux MS		IN		
240	Peirce, W.,MS		IN		
412	Gillespie MS		IN		
413	Shoemaker MS		IN		
415	Rhodes MS		IN		
510	Jones MS		IN		
511	Penn Treaty MS		IN		
512	Stetson MS				IN
513	Wanamaker MS		IN		
514	Stoddart-Flei.MS			IN	
517	Bilingual MS	2	IN		
Totals			33	16	12

APPENDIX A-5

Table 4a: A Comparison of Reading Projects' Achievement in Grades 1 - 8
From Spring 1989 (Pretest) to Spring 1990 (Posttest)

PROJECTS	GRADE LEVELS							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
PUPILS WITH HIGHER POSTTEST SCORES(%)								
DISTRICT READING	58.26	40.22	63.10	49.24	56.13	32.62	60.30	46.80
OPTION 4	60.00	51.32	60.82	46.05	58.10	41.81	57.00	59.09
SCHOOLWIDE	66.90	45.37	61.43	50.94	58.37	24.45	62.31	48.38
PROJECT SUCCESS	65.90	51.35	69.73	50.74	NS	NS	NS	NS
READING CENTERS	NS	*	68.88	51.85	48.57	50.00	NS	NS
PRESCRIPTION LABS	NS	*	69.31	63.88	50.00	*	NS	NS
BENCHMARK	NS	NS	86.36	59.60	59.45	62.06	NS	NS
UNGRADED(AT RISK)	NS	NS	NS	NS	46.15	42.00	56.09	43.93
WORLD AFFAIRS	NS	NS	NS	56.80	50.00	37.99	*	NS
ESOL	63.25	42.93	63.77	67.10	60.33	55.10	73.91	42.85
ALL SERVICES COMBINED	64.00	44.34	62.14	50.36	57.06	36.34	59.50	46.66
CHANGES IN NCES								
DISTRICT READING	4.45	-2.66	5.29	0.14	1.79	-3.92	3.27	-1.19
OPTION 4	4.24	2.37	4.87	0.01	2.09	-1.32	3.51	4.78
SCHOOLWIDE	10.37	-0.71	4.84	1.06	2.47	-5.98	3.71	-2.93
PROJECT SUCCESS	11.09	3.05	8.54	0.42	NS	NS	NS	NS
READING CENTERS	NS	*	6.71	0.78	1.37	1.90	NS	NS
PRESCRIPTION LABS	NS	*	7.85	2.66	2.30	*	NS	NS
BENCHMARK	NS	NS	15.27	3.52	2.61	3.17	NS	NS
UNGRADED(AT RISK)	NS	NS	NS	NS	-2.49	-2.40	1.74	-2.62
WORLD AFFAIRS	NS	NS	NS	2.52	-2.60	-2.27	*	NS
ESOL	7.48	-1.17	5.59	5.97	2.07	1.55	7.04	-1.46
ALL SERVICES COMBINED	8.55	-1.05	5.13	0.73	2.08	-2.90	3.10	-1.23

Notes:

1. The percentages and NCE gains vary considerable from grade to grade. Because of this variation, which may be related to the characteristics of the test, achievement comparisons should be done within a grade rather than across grades.
2. * = Insufficient data to conduct a meaningful analysis.
3. NS = Service not provided at this grade level.

APPENDIX A-5 Continued

Table 4b: A Comparison of Chapter 1 Mathematics Projects' Achievement in Grades 1 -8
From Spring 1989 (Pretest) to Spring 1990 (Posttest)

PROJECTS	GRADE LEVELS							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
PUPILS WITH HIGHER POSTTEST SCORES(%)								
PROJECT SUCCESS	72.62	56.34	51.31	60.56	NS	NS	NS	NS
SCHOOLWIDE	76.70	59.89	49.79	51.07	49.91	67.36	61.00	45.83
OPTION 4	76.85	58.82	54.39	57.62	42.53	61.68	60.91	54.45
EMRT	73.95	60.42	52.58	48.29	53.17	61.53	58.82	45.45
SECONDARY MATHEMATICS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	60.37	62.01	40.60
BENCHMARK	NS	NS	77.27	52.63	47.36	82.75	NS	NS
UNGRADED (AT RISK)	NS	NS	NS	NS	43.58	63.13	59.24	41.94
ALL SERVICES COMBINED	76.26	59.79	50.70	51.27	48.70	63.13	60.64	43.39
CHANGES IN NCES								
PROJECT SUCCESS	19.99	5.23	1.03	3.73	NS	NS	NS	NS
SCHOOLWIDE	19.99	7.42	0.61	2.13	1.52	10.08	4.66	-0.15
OPTION 4	24.44	4.18	0.47	4.22	-2.37	5.81	4.18	1.31
EMRT	14.92	7.94	0.91	-0.98	3.62	7.95	5.30	-2.95
SECONDARY MATHEMATICS	NS	NS	NS	NS	-4.77	7.26	5.20	-2.52
BENCHMARK	NS	NS	13.77	4.34	-1.64	19.55	NS	NS
UNGRADED (AT RISK)	NS	NS	NS	NS	-3.43	4.69	2.83	-2.27
ALL SERVICES COMBINED	19.65	7.25	0.73	1.89	0.69	7.34	4.36	-1.76

Notes:

1. The percentages and NCE gains vary considerable from grade to grade. Because of this variation, which may be related to the characteristics of the test, achievement comparisons should be done within a grade rather than across grades.
2. * = Insufficient data to conduct a meaningful analysis.
3. NS = Service is not provided at this grade level.

APPENDIX A-6

Table 5: Cohort 1 Schoolwide Projects Sites Showing the Percentage of All Students Receiving Final Report Card Marks of A, B, or C for Three Consecutive Years

Code	Name	Reading			Mathematics			Science			Social Studies		
		1988	1989	1990	1988	1989	1990	1988	1989	1990	1988	1989	1990
130	Harrington	61.00	65.00	66.80	63.00	60.00	71.20	91.00	88.00	92.00	82.00	73.00	82.60
136	McMichael	62.00	80.00	75.70	59.00	59.00	67.00	69.00	79.00	78.50	75.00	77.00	80.20
143	Wilson	73.00	70.00	87.90	62.00	67.00	83.00	71.00	82.00	88.70	71.00	73.00	87.90
220	Alcorn	54.00	61.00	64.70	53.00	58.00	54.30	86.00	66.00	66.00	71.00	68.00	70.10
242	Reynolds	65.00	77.00	70.50	60.00	62.00	63.60	64.00	74.00	70.40	73.00	78.00	78.00
243	Palumbo	60.00	53.00	52.30	55.00	60.00	61.20	67.00	70.00	74.50	62.00	67.00	65.20
249	Waring	82.00	78.00	85.70	69.00	71.00	81.90	74.00	86.00	86.80	75.00	76.00	83.60
254	Key	71.00	81.00	62.70	70.00	76.00	76.20	71.00	85.00	81.20	73.00	77.00	76.20
259	Nebinger	78.00	77.00	74.30	69.00	59.00	53.30	73.00	72.00	67.30	72.00	55.00	66.50
273	Washington, Geo.	84.00	80.00	79.80	74.00	72.00	73.00	77.00	79.00	76.10	85.00	85.00	77.50
427	Dick	74.00	71.00	69.40	59.00	67.00	71.30	74.00	83.00	89.80	65.00	72.00	76.40
430	Heston	84.00	81.00	82.20	69.00	67.00	73.60	70.00	76.00	84.40	70.00	75.00	79.20
431	Kenderton	66.00	58.00	61.60	59.00	59.00	61.80	74.00	72.00	76.10	73.00	67.00	74.10
433	Leidy	86.00	78.00	74.20	77.00	73.00	68.40	79.00	84.00	81.50	80.00	86.00	80.40
440	Stanton, M H	66.00	66.00	66.60	56.00	66.00	68.80	76.00	90.00	86.60	73.00	74.00	66.80
442	Walton	44.00	54.00	68.40	47.00	60.00	58.20	76.00	76.00	78.40	67.00	70.00	68.20
443	Whittier	65.00	NA	70.80	69.00	68.00	74.50	83.00	83.00	88.90	77.00	82.00	85.40
444	Allen, E D	68.00	63.00	73.00	75.00	84.00	82.30	91.00	97.00	96.70	90.00	92.00	94.70
446	Duckrey	84.00	72.00	76.40	64.00	68.00	70.90	82.00	78.00	80.60	79.00	76.00	81.60
451	Douglass, F.	67.00	67.00	69.80	70.00	70.00	72.40	78.00	85.00	79.40	78.00	65.00	66.70
453	Gideon	86.00	82.00	79.80	76.00	65.00	64.10	74.00	76.00	72.60	78.00	72.00	67.40
457	Meade	66.00	71.00	64.40	67.00	61.00	70.10	80.00	79.00	74.90	79.00	78.00	73.10
526	Elkin	62.00	62.00	56.80	62.00	65.00	68.00	73.00	71.00	77.10	75.00	69.00	75.30
530	Hackett	74.00	67.00	74.30	77.00	75.00	79.60	85.00	87.00	94.20	82.00	85.00	85.60
531	Harrison	63.00	66.00	71.10	68.00	69.00	67.30	78.00	84.00	86.50	81.00	75.00	78.10
532	Hartranft	57.00	45.00	53.20	65.00	66.00	60.00	94.00	86.00	83.40	86.00	82.00	78.90
534	Ludlow	48.00	52.00	69.20	68.00	69.00	64.90	70.00	NA	78.90	70.00	74.00	71.00
535	McKinley	56.00	63.00	62.50	60.00	70.00	63.30	83.00	82.00	80.30	71.00	74.00	79.80
547	Cramp	56.00	50.00	61.70	58.00	63.00	64.40	70.00	79.00	78.20	77.00	80.00	77.70
548	Kearny	74.00	63.00	72.30	60.00	66.00	75.40	75.00	80.00	88.20	77.00	78.00	85.90
556	Spring Garden	75.00	76.00	75.90	61.00	67.00	74.50	73.00	84.00	81.00	74.00	82.00	77.40
632	Mifflin	49.00	61.00	59.60	58.00	64.00	67.20	61.00	72.00	74.60	64.00	NA	71.80
643	Wister	71.00	72.00	72.10	58.00	66.00	54.40	50.00	65.00	56.40	72.00	69.00	62.40
644	Linglebach	74.00	74.00	89.70	66.00	75.00	86.70	82.00	93.00	98.50	82.00	89.00	92.10
647	Kelly, J B	54.00	60.00	70.00	69.00	72.00	78.20	87.00	93.00	88.30	89.00	93.00	92.80
738	McClure	61.00	70.00	67.50	76.00	72.00	74.60	89.00	79.00	84.20	77.00	81.00	78.60
744	Taylor	40.00	43.00	52.10	63.00	70.00	65.80	75.00	75.00	76.40	68.00	67.00	64.70

SWP Site with Higher
Percentage of A's, B's
and C's in 1990 than 1988

23

28

28

26

APPENDIX A - 7

Reading Change Scores for Schoolwide Projects Cohort 1: Preprogram Record (3 year) vs. Program Record to Date (2 Year)

SCH CODE	SCH NAME	NCE GAINS FOR 3 PREPROGRAM YEARS			THREE YEAR AVG GAIN	NCE GAINS FOR 2 YRS		TWO YEAR AVG GAIN	SITES EXCEEDING PREPROGRAM LEVEL
		1985-86	1986-87	1987-88		1988-89	1989-90		
130	HARRINGTON	-7.10	5.23	3.29	2.78	4.83	2.70	3.74	1
136	MCMICHAEL	-5.98	6.06	3.13	2.61	4.15	-0.94	1.88	0
143	WILSON	-2.22	3.99	4.74	3.53	4.43	5.05	4.77	1
220	ALCORN	-14.95	6.94	7.74	2.49	4.45	1.22	2.89	1
242	REYNOLDS	-16.22	4.47	5.20	0.78	4.34	-0.20	2.03	1
243	PALUMBO	-0.29	3.35	1.83	1.63	3.95	2.14	2.90	1
249	WARING	-10.79	8.12	4.06	0.90	8.60	1.06	4.37	1
254	KEY	-7.07	2.90	7.59	4.18	5.88	0.17	2.55	0
259	NEBINGER	-2.07	4.66	11.15	6.52	4.34	1.46	2.64	0
273	WASHINGTON	-1.02	1.73	4.28	2.19	4.37	3.39	3.78	1
427	DICK	-9.65	7.18	2.54	0.46	0.65	4.16	2.41	1
430	HESTON	-5.19	8.32	9.54	5.83	6.27	2.23	4.35	0
431	KENDERTON	-3.89	7.45	7.04	5.95	5.32	5.56	5.46	0
433	LEIDY	-9.75	7.29	9.06	3.51	4.42	-0.19	1.77	0
440	STANTON	-16.48	7.88	7.24	4.19	3.39	8.15	5.99	1
442	WALTON	-7.01	4.22	4.69	2.13	8.94	-1.71	3.82	1
443	WHITTIER	-8.73	4.22	8.91	3.23	5.58	0.10	2.39	0
444	ALLEN	-18.50	6.21	5.26	3.54	4.62	1.43	2.94	0
446	DUCKREY	-13.04	6.46	1.56	1.10	6.20	-0.56	2.94	1
451	DOUGLASS,F	-11.89	3.41	3.82	0.18	4.08	0.87	2.22	1
453	GIDEON	-9.21	5.06	6.45	3.02	2.28	-0.85	0.41	0
457	MEADE	-11.40	5.44	4.28	1.83	4.26	1.40	2.79	1
526	ELKIN	-5.96	8.15	6.99	6.98	3.87	-0.20	1.96	0
530	HACKETT	-2.39	3.52	8.00	4.46	8.06	1.14	4.84	1
531	HARRISON	-12.07	7.39	6.53	2.18	7.21	1.35	4.23	1
532	HARTMANFT	1.55	3.16	4.37	3.59	1.32	4.09	2.58	0
534	LUDLOW	-12.55	5.94	5.26	3.63	6.85	3.19	4.94	1
535	MCKINLEY	-10.13	5.34	3.40	1.67	4.23	4.49	4.35	1
547	CRAMP	-7.24	3.40	7.04	2.98	3.65	4.38	4.09	1
548	KEARNY	-10.45	2.36	7.76	3.07	3.01	6.56	4.87	1
556	SPRING GARD	-14.88	8.92	5.80	1.72	5.06	8.28	6.57	1
632	MIFFLIN	-6.36	4.69	6.17	3.28	3.78	-1.20	1.52	0
643	WISTER	-18.50	9.38	12.74	8.99	8.45	4.74	6.34	0
644	LINGELBACH	-16.98	7.56	4.71	1.84	6.30	7.92	7.09	1
647	KELLY,J B	-10.84	4.38	5.36	4.07	4.31	3.04	3.67	0
738	MCCLURE	-18.92	6.18	4.70	3.68	3.26	-1.58	0.75	0
744	TAYLOR	-8.00	5.00	5.93	5.03	9.17	0.28	4.15	0
		-9.36	5.57	5.90	3.24	4.97	2.25	3.54	21

*Note: In order to be included in this analysis:

1. Pupils require both a pretest and a posttest score
2. Pupils were either eligible for Chapter 1 reading or their pretest score was at or below the Chapter 1 eligibility cut-off
3. The September 1, 1989 grade organization (range) was used for each year
4. Compliance with Chapter 1 Regulations requires the exclusion of grade 1 from the analysis

APPENDIX A-8

Math Change Scores for Schoolwide Projects Cohort 1: Preprogram Record (3 Years) vs. Program Record to Date (2 Years)

SCH CODE	SCH NAME	NCE GAINS FOR 3 PREPROGRAM YEARS			THREE YEAR AVG GAIN	NCE GAINS FOR 2 YRS		TWO YEAR AVG GAIN	SITES EXCEEDING PREPROGRAM LEVEL
		1985-86	1986-87	1987-88		1988-89	1989-90		
130	HARRINGTON	4.76	11.88	7.15	8.50	7.54	3.68	5.32	0
136	MCMICHAEL	3.64	11.66	6.83	8.53	7.17	3.87	5.54	0
143	WILSON	-0.11	14.68	11.10	8.53	4.46	6.65	5.61	0
220	ALCORN	-6.31	7.52	8.23	6.78	10.72	4.94	7.97	1
242	REYNOLDS	-3.51	9.25	13.00	9.41	8.03	0.33	3.69	0
243	PALUMBO	-8.84	13.51	12.78	5.97	9.43	9.66	9.53	1
249	WARING	0.67	20.27	14.35	9.05	12.81	4.64	8.09	0
254	KEY	2.15	11.88	9.71	9.20	15.52	-4.24	3.63	0
259	NEBINGER	0.90	13.24	12.51	9.39	9.65	7.96	8.83	0
273	WASHINGTON	-2.83	6.73	11.70	5.54	7.03	7.60	7.31	1
427	DICK	-3.46	14.93	8.29	8.49	6.97	7.31	7.13	0
430	HESTON	-1.01	15.97	16.53	11.80	9.12	4.27	6.56	0
431	KENDERTON	-8.47	15.87	12.51	10.43	8.47	3.75	6.21	0
433	LEIDY	-4.66	15.70	10.28	9.06	10.13	7.29	8.43	0
440	STANTON	-13.43	15.16	17.00	9.31	7.82	9.46	8.65	0
442	WALTON	6.92	14.26	13.35	12.36	14.57	5.58	10.10	0
443	WHITTIER	-3.70	11.39	10.86	8.17	9.34	2.64	5.64	0
444	ALLEN	-8.30	10.43	14.00	9.16	3.83	2.47	3.04	0
446	DUCKREY	-12.90	12.09	10.87	8.44	11.34	1.60	7.05	0
451	DOUGLASS, F	-31.28	12.75	6.95	8.98	9.12	1.47	5.02	0
453	GIDEON	-6.91	14.48	25.68	13.44	12.08	2.53	6.49	0
457	MEADE	-6.36	13.74	9.54	8.29	6.75	-2.44	1.80	0
526	ELKIN	-7.34	11.97	14.93	12.24	11.50	3.32	7.11	0
530	HACKETT	-7.72	10.28	14.25	8.28	12.27	-3.50	5.45	0
531	HARRISON	-11.42	11.48	9.17	5.87	11.86	2.79	7.40	1
532	HARTRANFT	2.57	10.59	12.79	10.00	8.43	-1.17	3.99	0
534	LUDLOW	-9.97	8.32	2.79	1.90	6.99	-2.46	2.76	1
535	MCKINLEY	-12.29	10.88	9.85	5.02	8.56	5.40	6.98	1
547	CRAMP	-4.17	9.60	7.27	7.39	11.11	5.15	7.99	1
548	KEARNY	-9.45	5.90	16.66	6.66	7.87	9.50	8.68	1
556	SPRING GARDEN	-5.61	16.64	18.51	12.52	9.39	6.21	7.79	0
632	MIFFLIN	-2.50	12.52	13.93	9.50	8.50	-0.06	4.42	0
643	WISTER	0.30	22.99	18.63	14.48	15.92	5.79	9.73	0
644	LINGELBACH	-1.04	13.76	7.36	8.48	12.35	11.23	11.85	1
647	KELLY, J B	2.08	11.49	8.19	8.80	8.98	4.00	6.31	0
738	MCCLURE	0.17	6.50	9.01	7.03	5.30	-4.99	-0.16	0
744	TAYLOR	-3.66	12.72	12.12	10.77	16.44	0.93	9.10	0
		-4.68	12.51	11.86	8.86	9.66	3.60	6.51	9

*Note: In order to be included in this analysis:

1. Pupils required both a pretest and a posttest
2. Pupils were either eligible for Chapter 1 Mathematics or their pretest score was at or below the Chapter 1 eligibility cut-off
3. The September 1, 1989 grade organization (range) was used for each year
4. Compliance with Chapter 1 Regulations requires the exclusion of grade 1 from the analyses

APPENDIX A-9

Table 7: Schoolwide Project Schools Cohort 1 Average Daily Attendance

Code	Name	82-83	83-84	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90
130	Harrington	84.50		87.50	88.60	88.40	[88.1]	89.10	90.41
136	McMichael	84.30	[87.6]	85.50	85.40	84.40	83.30	83.90	87.75
143	Wilson	84.50		87.90	87.80	86.30	[87.7]	84.90	89.57
220	Alcorn	85.80		87.10	87.10	85.10	[84.8]	87.10	86.98
242	Reynolds	85.00		88.90	[87.6]	86.10	85.70	89.40	88.47
243	Palumbo	82.60		84.60	[85.9]	86.20	86.50	83.30	85.24
249	Waring	86.10	[89.7]	88.20	88.00	88.40	87.40	86.40	87.04
254	Key	86.40		90.60	91.40	90.10	[89.9]	92.00	93.53
259	Nebinger	84.10		87.50	85.60	86.50	[84.3]	89.90	89.56
273	Washington, G	85.20	[87.2]	89.00	87.20	85.20	87.80	89.00	89.29
427	Dick	84.70	[87.7]	89.60	88.90	88.10	86.70	88.80	88.66
430	Heston	88.10	[89.4]	89.80	90.90	88.80	90.10	89.70	89.04
431	Kenderton	86.60		89.20	87.70	88.30	[85.1]	86.80	87.10
433	Leidy	[85.3]	87.90	88.20	88.20	89.50	90.20	90.80	86.92
440	Stanton, MH	87.30		90.30	89.30	89.80	[90.1]	90.60	90.04
442	Walton	88.80		89.60	89.90	85.30	[88.0]	91.70	91.02
443	Whittier	87.60		89.80	89.60	89.20	[87.9]	90.80	88.57
444	Allen, E	89.20		91.10	90.40	90.90	[90.0]	90.30	91.19
446	Duckrey	86.10		89.30	88.30	87.30	[85.8]	89.20	88.34
451	Douglass	83.60	[86.0]	89.00	87.50	86.10	87.80	87.10	86.01
453	Gideon	85.90		89.70	89.30	89.90	[90.5]	92.30	92.58
457	Meade	85.50	[88.9]	88.60	88.10	87.40	86.50	92.30	87.02
526	Elkin	82.70		85.50	86.30	85.30	[85.2]	85.90	86.66
530	Hackett	85.90	[85.7]	85.30	86.30	85.00	87.10	88.20	90.20
531	Harrison	84.80		87.20	[87.2]	87.50	86.70	87.60	88.30
532	Hartranft	84.50		86.90	86.50	85.00	[85.7]	88.20	88.72
534	Ludlow	83.30		86.20	[85.0]	86.80	87.90	87.90	87.66
535	McKinley	87.60		88.00	86.50	86.90	[85.7]	88.10	88.62
547	Cramp	86.30		89.20	88.80	87.60	[88.4]	87.10	87.95
548	Kearny	[88.3]	87.40	87.30	87.60	85.80	85.90	84.60	88.07
556	Sp. Gdn	85.30		83.70	[85.6]	84.90	84.30	87.20	87.61
632	Mifflin	82.60		88.40	[87.7]	86.80	87.70	87.70	87.14
643	Wister	87.30		89.60	87.70	88.70	[87.2]	86.90	89.86
644	Lingelbach	[84.3]	86.60	83.50	83.50	83.00	84.50	87.40	91.78
647	Kelly	87.40		89.40	89.50	88.30	[86.3]	87.30	89.66
738	McClure	[87.6]	88.20	89.60	87.80	86.40	86.20	85.40	86.47
744	Taylor	86.70		88.20	87.00	86.70	[85.3]	84.50	88.78

Note: [] indicates year preceeding first year as SWP

Bibliography

- Davidoff, S.H., 1988. Annual Chapter 1 Needs Assessment. Chapter 1 Application for 1988-1989. Philadelphia, PA: School District of Philadelphia, Office of Categorical Programs, Thomas C. Rosica, Executive Director and Robert F. Magliano, Director, July, 1988.
- Davidoff, S.H. and R.J. Fishman, 1989. Chapter 1 Evaluation And Reporting System (Report No. 8903). Philadelphia, PA: School District of Philadelphia, Office of Research and Evaluation. ERIC ED 308234, TM013622, Resources in Education, November, 1989.
- Davidoff, S.H., Pierson, E.M. and R.J. Fishman, 1989. Indicator Based Evaluations for Chapter 1. San Francisco, CA. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association. ERIC ED 308226, TM013595, Resources in Education. November, 1989.
- Davis, A. and M.R. Quilling, 1990. Meeting the Accountability Requirements for Schoolwide Projects. TAC Regions B and D, August 1990.
- Lauer, L., 1988. Chapter 1 Task Force Report. Philadelphia, PA: School District of Philadelphia, Office of Instruction, March, 1988.
- Lytle, J.H., Davidoff, S.H., Pierson, E.M., Herron, W. and E.Kemp, 1990. The Promise of Schoolwide Projects. Philadelphia, PA: School District of Philadelphia. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Boston, April 1990.
- Lytle, J.H., Education Weekly, "Chapter 1 Opens Options for Schoolwide Plans", Commentary Section, December 14, 1988.